



# UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450  
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/519,151	03/06/2000	Manuel Zahariev	P3001D1	7821

29053 7590 05/19/2005

DALLAS OFFICE OF FULBRIGHT & JAWORSKI L.L.P.  
2200 ROSS AVENUE  
SUITE 2800  
DALLAS, TX 75201-2784

EXAMINER

DONAGHUE, LARRY D

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
----------	--------------

2154

DATE MAILED: 05/19/2005

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

## Office Action Summary

Application No.

09/519,151

Applicant(s)

ZAHARIEV, MANUEL

Examiner

Larry D. Donaghue

Art Unit

2154

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

### Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

### Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 12/22/2004.
- 2a) ☒ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☐ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

### Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-13 and 15-29 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-13 and 15-29 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

### Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on \_\_\_\_\_ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.  
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).  
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

### Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some \* c) ☐ None of:
- ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
  - ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. \_\_\_\_\_.
  - ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).
- \* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

### Attachment(s)

- |  |   |
|--|---|
| 1) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)   | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413)<br>Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)                                   | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)             |
| 3) <input type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)<br>Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____ | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____  |

Art Unit: 2154

1. Claims 1-13 and 15-29 are presented for examination.
2. The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless -

(e) the invention was described in (1) an application for patent, published under section 122(b), by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent or (2) a patent granted on an application for patent by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent, except that an international application filed under the treaty defined in section 351(a) shall have the effects for purposes of this subsection of an application filed in the United States only if the international application designated the United States and was published under Article 21(2) of such treaty in the English language.

3. Claims 1, 2, 5-6, 9-10, 13 and 15 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by Pepe et al. (5,742,905).

Pepe et al. taught the invention (claim 1) as claimed, a server (40) connected to a network; and a Mail Alert code set resident and operable on the server, wherein the Mail Alert code set is adapted to compare characteristics of e-mail messages received for the subscriber to specific message characteristics provided by the subscriber and pre-stored on the server (col. 4, line 56- col. 5, line 9; col. 7, line 3-15), to alert the subscriber when a characteristic match is found, (col. 31, lines 30-65) and to execute instructions received from the subscriber in response to the alert for forwarding of the message received for which a match was found (col. 34, lines 59-65; col. 4, line 56-67 and fig 35-39, Pepe et al. taught the application of the CallCommand to E-mail (col. 30, lines 14-26) ).

As to claim 2, Pepe et al. taught the subscriber is alerted on finding a characteristic match by sending a page to a paging device carried by the subscriber (col. 5, lines 60-67).

Pepe et al. taught the invention (claim 5) as claimed, an e-mail system (40) adapted for receiving and forwarding e-mail; and a Mail Alert system adapted to compare characteristics of e-mail messages received for the subscriber to specific message characteristics provided by the subscriber and pre-stored on the server (col. 4, line 56- col. 5, line 9; col. 7, line 3-15), to alert the subscriber when a characteristic match is found (col. 31, lines 30-65), and to execute instructions received from the subscriber in response to the alert for forwarding of the message received for which a match was found (col. 34, lines 60-65; col. 4, line 56-67 and fig 35-39, Pepe et al. taught the application of the CallCommand to E-mail (col. 30, lines 14-26)).

4. As to claim 6, Pepe et al. taught the invention the subscriber is alerted on finding a characteristic match by sending a page to a paging device carried by the subscriber (col. 5, lines 60-67).

Art Unit: 2154

5. As to claim 9, Pepe et al. taught prerecording on a mail server characteristics for messages to be routed, the characteristics provided by a subscriber; receiving messages addressed to the subscriber at the mail server; comparing characteristics of messages received to the prerecorded characteristics provided by the subscriber (col. 4, line 56- col. 5, line 9; col. 7, line 3-15); identifying and storing on the mail server messages received for the subscriber for which a match is found to the prerecorded characteristics (col. 4, line 56- col. 5, line 9; col. 7, line 3-15); alerting the subscriber to the receipt of one or more messages for which a characteristic match is found (col. 4, line 56- col. 5, line 9; col. 7, line 3-15, col. 31, lines 30-65); receiving instructions for forwarding the stored messages from the subscriber in response to the alert Col. 31, lines 32-65 and col. 29, lines 42-64); and; forwarding the stored messages for which a match is found to destinations provided by the subscriber in response to the alert (col. 19, line 30- col. 20, line 25, Pepe et al. taught the application of the CallCommand to E-mail (col. 30, lines 14-26)).

6. As to claim 10, Pepe et al. taught wherein, in the alerting step, a page is sent to a pager carried by the subscriber to alert the subscriber to the receipt of the one or more messages (col. 5, lines 60-67).

7. As to claim 13, Pepe et al. taught agent for processing e-mail messages, comprising: a stored list of message characteristics provided by a subscriber; a receiver adapted for receiving e-mail messages and ascertaining message characteristics of the received messages (col. 4, line 56- col. 5, line 9; col. 7, line 3-15); a comparator adapted for comparing characteristics of received messages with stored characteristics, and tagging those messages wherein the characteristics match (col. 4, line 56- col. 5, line 9; col. 7, line 3-15); an alert mechanism for alerting a subscriber to the receipt of messages having characteristics matching the stored characteristics (col. 4, line 56- col. 5, line 9; col. 7, line 3-15);, and a save facility adapted for storing matched messages against future distribution instructions, the future distribution instructions received from the subscriber in response to the alert (col. 19, line 30- col. 20, line 25, Pepe et al. taught the application of the CallCommand to E-mail (col. 30, lines 14-26), col. 31, lines 34-65, and col. 29, lines 42-64) .

8. As to claim 15, Pepe et al. taught the alert mechanism comprises a page transmitter adapted for transmitting a page signal to a pager carried by the subscriber (col. 5, lines 60-67).

9. Claims 4, 8, 11 and 17 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as applied to claims 1, 2, and 5-6 as being unpatentable over Pepe et al. (5,742,905).

10. Pepe et al. did not expressly disclose the use of the automated telephone menu for responding to the alert. Pepe et al. did disclose the use of a telephone menu (col. 11, lines 14-32) and Pepe et al. discloses the use of cross media notification and performing the redirection in real time (col. 20, line 42 - col. 21, line 53). Pepe et al. taught that the system is for operating with mobile equipment such as PDA, pager and cellular phone (col. 5, lines 56-67). It

Art Unit: 2154

would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention in view of the cited teachings that an automated telephone menu for responding to the alert would have been an obvious modification, as Pepe et al. expressly disclosed that the media and format for delivery is selectable by the subscriber (col. 6, lines 1-19).

11. Claims 3, 7, 12 and 18 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Pepe et al. (5,742,905) as applied to claims , above, and further in view of Fuller et al. (6,545,589).

Pepe et al. did not expressly disclose the involvement of an operator in the system, Fuller et al. taught the use of operator in a menu system to aid the user (col. 46, lines 12-30). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the data processing art at the time of the invention to allow for operator assists to aid the user in directing the calls.

12. Claims 19-29 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by Pepe et al. (5,742,905).

As to claim 19, Pepe et al. taught receiving a message for a subscriber (at least col. 29, lines 42- col. 30, line 13); comparing the message to criteria (at least col. 29, line 41- col. 30, line 13, figures 38 and 39); if the message matches the criteria (col. 29, lines 41-46, figures 38 and 39), then sending an alert to the subscriber (col. 29, line 42- col. 30, line 13, figures 38 and 39); receiving a reply from the subscriber in response to the alert, the reply comprising instructions for the message; and processing the message according to the instructions (col. 29, line 47- col. 30, line 13, col. 31, lines 33-65)).

As to claim 20, Pepe et al. taught the message is an email message (col. 20, lines 13-53) .

As to claim 21, Pepe et al. taught the alert is a notification message that identifies the received message and criteria matching the message (col. 20, lines 13-53).

As to claim 22, Pepe et al. taught the comparing step comprises filtering the message to determine if parts of the message meet the criteria (col. 4, line 56- col. 5, line 9; col. 7, line 3-15).

As to claim 23, Pepe et al. taught the criteria are selected from the group consisting of message sender information; message subject line information; message body information; and message attachment information.

The claim is in the alternative, see (col. 29, line 42- col. 30, line 13, figures 38 and 39).

As to claim 24, Pepe et al. taught wherein the alert comprises at least a portion of the message (col. 20, lines 42-57).

As to claim 25, Pepe et al. taught the alert is a message sent to a pager (col. 23, line 63 – col. , line 13).

As to claim 26, Pepe et al. taught wherein the alert is a message sent to a phone (32,26).

Art Unit: 2154

As to claim 27, Pepe et al. taught the instructions comprise a command to forward the message to a new destination (col. 29, line 47- col. 30, line 13).

As to claim 28, Pepe et al. taught the new destination is selected from the group consisting of an e-mail address; a fax number; a telephone number; a hand-held computer; a notebook computer; a server computer; and an Internet Service Provider (ISP) (col. 29, line 47-col. 30, line 13, figure 3, 22, 48, 32, 24, 34).

As to claim 29, Pepe et al. taught wherein the reply is received via an entity selected from the group consisting of an operator; a voice-response system; a telephone call; an auto attendant; and a two-way pager.

The claim is in the alternative Pepe et al. taught at least the use of a phone (32,26).

13. Applicant's arguments filed 12/ 22/2004 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive.
14. Applicant argues Pepe does not disclose sending an alert in response to the receipt of an email message that matches characteristics, and executing instructions received from the subscriber in response to the alert.
15. Applicant argues that executing instructions for forwarding email received from a subscriber in response to an alert, is not present in the disclosure of Pepe.
16. Applicant argues that Pepe does not show a system that receives instructions in response to sending an alert and then forwards email according to the instructions.
17. Applicant argues that Pepe does not shown future distribution in response to instructions received from the subscriber in response to an alert.
18. Applicant argues that Pepe does not describe a system in which messages are treated based on instructions from a subscriber which, are sent directly in response to an alert.

In response, Pepe et al. taught the CallCommand service and it application to E-Mail (col. 30, lines 14-27). Pepe et al. taught that based on a message matching criteria sending an alert (col. 31, lines 33-65) and in response to the alert supplying forwarding instructions (col. 29, lines 42-63).

19. **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL.** Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of this final action.

Art Unit: 2154

20. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Larry D. Donaghue whose telephone number is 571-272-3962. The examiner can normally be reached on M-F 8:00-5:00.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, John Follansbee can be reached on 571-272-3964. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 703-872-9306.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

LARRY D. DONAGHUE  
PRIMARY EXAMINER

